UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,779	01/12/2004	Rachel Heitz	03292.101860.	1778
	7590 10/20/200 CELLA (AMEX)	8	EXAMINER	
30 ROCKEFEL	LER PLAZA		KAZIMI, HANI M	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/707,779	HEITZ ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hani Kazimi	3691
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tilt d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 € This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1,2,5-13 and 15-22 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-13 and 15-22 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
<u> </u>		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ccepted or b) objected to by the edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/707,779 Page 2

Art Unit: 3691

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on July 25, 2008. Claims 1, 2, 5-13 and 15-22 are pending in the application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/25/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2, 4-13 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levine et al (US 5477038) in view of Shimizu et al (US 5898158) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA")(US 20050154670).

Application/Control Number: 10/707,779

Art Unit: 3691

Page 3

Claims 1, 17 and 21-22; Levine teaches a method and a corresponding system for facilitating distribution of a transaction account card through a distributor, the method comprising the steps of: issuing a transaction account card to the distributor (col. 2, lines 31-32); and receiving information from the distributor via local software, wherein said information reports the distribution of said transaction account card, wherein said card is one of a plurality of cards, and wherein said plurality of cards are consigned in groups to the distributor (col. 2, lines 31-57).

Levine does not teach wherein said transaction account card is a credit card or a debit card; receiving information via MICR protocol or preexisting Traveler's Check infrastructure. However, Levine explicitly teaches prepaid cards (abstract). Shimizu teaches the concept of alternatively using a credit card or bank card in place of prepaid card (col. 43, lines 57-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Levine's prepaid card to include credit card or debit card as alternatives for the obvious reason of increasing the flexibility of the method.

AAPA discloses that the use of MICR protocol or preexisting Travelers Check infrastructure to receive information from a distributor regarding a sale of Travelers Check is old and well known (see Background of Invention (Para 003-0010). Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rest not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself- that is in the substitution of the local software for the MICR protocol or preexisting Traveler's Check infrastructure. Thus, the simple

Art Unit: 3691

substitution of one known element for another for producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

Claim 2; Levine teaches the step of activating said distributed transaction account card (abstract).

Claim 5; See claim 1 analysis above. Levine in view of AAPA further teaches the steps of: associating a first number with said transaction account card, wherein said first number is configured to conform to said MICR protocol, wherein said first number comprises, at least in part, a plurality of sequential numbers; and associating a second number with said transaction account card, wherein said second number is a randomized account number (col. 2, lines 47-58).

Claim 6; See claim 1 analysis above. Levine in view of AAPA further teaches wherein a purchase agreement is associated with said card and bears indicia of said first number.

Claim 7; See claim 1 analysis above. Levine in view of AAPA further teaches wherein said indicia of said first number is embodied in a MICR line visible on said purchase agreement form.

Claim 8; See claim 1 analysis above. Levine in view of AAPA further teaches wherein

Art Unit: 3691

said second number is an account number, wherein said distribution comprises a sale of said transaction account, and wherein the distributor is a third party seller.

Claim 9; See claim 1 analysis above. Levine in view of AAPA further teaches the step of processing said information via a pre-established travelers cheque infrastructure.

Claim 10; See claim 1 analysis above. Levine in view of AAPA further teaches the step of paying said third party seller a commission for said sale of said transaction account based on at least a portion of the information received from said third party seller (col. 6, lines 14-20).

Claim 11; See claim 1 analysis above. Levine in view of AAPA further teaches a serial number and an account number, and wherein said activating step further comprises the step of confirming that activation is appropriate by confirming at least one of the following information received from said third party distributor: a purchase location, said serial number and said account number (col. 2, lines 47-58).

Claims 12 and 16; Levine teaches a transaction account distribution device for facilitating the distribution of a card by a distributor, said transaction account distribution device comprising a card, wherein said card is also associated with a first number that is configured for communication in a protocol;

Art Unit: 3691

Levine does not teach MICR protocol or Travelers check infrastructure; and a purchase agreement form configured to bear a MICR line configured to be machine read for conveying said first number to a computer system. However, AAPA discloses that the use of MICR protocol or preexisting Travelers Check infrastructure to receive information from a distributor regarding a sale of Travelers Check is old and well known. In addition AAPA discloses the use PAF in a Travelers check transaction (see Background of Invention). Since each individual element and its function are shown in the prior art, the difference between the claimed subject matter and the prior art rest not on any individual element or function but in the very combination itself- that is in the substitution of the local software for the MICR protocol or preexisting Traveler's Check infrastructure including the use of PAF. Thus, the simple substitution of one known element for another for producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

Claims 13 and 18-19; See claim 1 analysis above. Levine teaches wherein said first number is a serialized number (col. 2, lines 48-58).

Claim 12; Levine teaches wherein said card is a pre-paid card (abstract).

Claim 20; Levine teaches wherein the cards are pre-paid cards and wherein each of the pre-paid cards is funded no earlier than the sale of the pre-paid card by the distributor (abstract).

Application/Control Number: 10/707,779 Page 7

Art Unit: 3691

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hani Kazimi whose telephone number is (571) 272-6745. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

/Hani M. Kazimi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691